# Time for Dawkins to Retire

Sam Fryman © Xmas 2006

Isn't it an amazing coincidence how close the surname of "God bashing" best selling author, evolutionist and Cambridge University biology professor *Richard Dawkins* is to that of his "progenitor" and "guru" and even we might say *God*, Charles *Darwin*?

All we have to do is place a small *r* in front of the *w*, take out the *k* and *s* and hey presto, *Dawkins evolves* (or *devolves*) into *Darwin*.

But we aren't going to get into debates about whether there is any truth in *numerology* here, we are going to try to work only with the *visibly rational* and *logically justifiable.*

And the first thing that is visible, if not wholly rational, is the existence of the latest piece of nihilistic pseudo scientific propaganda, masquerading as *hard science* – i.e. that which is based on proven experiments that *work* right in front of our eyes, and not "theories" about matters whose reality are lost in the mists of time like *the origin of life*, or let's see some scientists *create* life in the laboratory, as opposed only to *genetically modifying* what's already extant – which is his latest piece of religious iconoclasm called *The God Delusion.*

Now let's not be so judgemental and prejudiced so quickly. Let's give Mr Dawkins the benefit of the doubt. Let's play "the devil's advocate." Let's suppose for a moment that he is *right*, that there is no god.

Then we are all alone in this scary universe, perhaps even *hopefully* alone, or else there might be some scary aliens landing any day, who are going to either wipe us all out like in H G Wells' *War of the Worlds*, or are going to use us as slaves or laboratory animals to be kept in cages and scientifically experimented upon. David Icke amongst others actually alleges that *they are already here*, and going along the enslaving route, which is one plausible reason at least why most of us are in the state of slavery and misery we are.

But being alone as a species is not quite so scary as our greater fear, which is because we are humans, not simply reacting to the present, but being able to learn from the past and imaginatively predict the future, we all know that the only certainty in life is that *we are going to die.*

So if Richard Dawkins is right, not only are we all going to die, *that's all there is*, and whether it's ten years or ten minutes away, who cares, the older people especially know how quickly time flies, and in our current scary culture, whether it be due to accident, crime, war or disease, even the young can die at any moment, so all our lives are fundamentally massively insecure.

Thus on the one hand we have Christ's gospel – i.e. his *good news* – that we are *immortal*, that we are "spiritual beings" who will one day inherit eternal life, and on the other hand we have Richard Dawkins and his atheist disciples who have got the decidedly *bad news* that *death is any day now*, we are all just waiting for death, and that's the end of you and me, my fellow lumps of meaningless fortuitously arranged but *very temporary* muck and slime, for all eternity.

That is, *even if it were true, that Dawkins was right*, you author, and most people *still alive* likely if they were honest would much *rather* believe that there is a God, and some purpose beyond our present terminally terminal existence, which idea of "hope" or "belief" of course one can legitimately call "wishful thinking" if one likes.

That is, we are not *here* trying to positively and definitively *prove* that God exists, but to ask firstly, *why* is Richard Dawkins so intent on proving the contrary?

So he tells us why *he thinks* he is so against the "God delusion."

He sees it as an affront to "rationality" and "scientific method." He sees the imposition of a "belief system" upon him as against his "human rights", he sees it as "the virus of faith" that causes trouble and war through history and in the present, even tries to prevent people having a no holds barred – so to speak – libertine sex life, and so on.

And we don't disagree that the kind of "shove it down your throat" religion that many of his generation grew up with – with its often cruel and hypocritical vicars and priests and even *nuns*, who in many cases for example seemed to enjoy physically beating children and generally "putting the fear of God" into them – was an abomination, and clearly not what the life story of Christ suggests was *the original agenda* of "Christianity", were it truly based on *the teachings* of Christ as per the gospel story.

But that is not necessarily a reason to reject the teachings of Christ himself, or the possible historical *fact* that he did actually survive in a "spiritual body" after the crucifixion, which of course is the fundamental basis of Christian "belief", i.e. that *resurrection* is possible, that a pine box is *not necessarily* the only ultimate destination of every human being, and that the life and "after-life" of Christ as reported in the gospels, including the "eye-witness" accounts of the apostles, and indeed Mary Magdalene, is *necessarily* a fairy story.

We were delighted to see this point made in a recent British Channel 4 TV documentary entitled *The Trouble With Atheism*, presented and produced by British journalist Rod Liddle, upon which Richard Dawkins was predictably an interviewee.

Basically, Rod Liddle's point was that the *atheist* is just as much a "believer" in their nihilistic faith, as the fanatical religious believer.

That is, on questioning a leading research physicist on the program, the researcher was forced to admit that there was *no scientific proof* that there is *no god.*

Let's repeat that once again, hopefully so loud that even Richard Dawkins can hear it:

*THERE IS NO SCIENTIFIC PROOF THAT HAS EVER BEEN DEVISED THAT PROVES THERE IS NO GOD.*

That is, Richard Dawkins is implying by the title of his book "The God Delusion" that he – speaking as a scientist – *believes* THERE IS NO GOD.

He is stating it as if it were scientific fact, scientifically proven.

Otherwise, his book would be entitled, *The God Question*, or *Doubts About the Existence of God*, rather than saying categorically the existence of God was a *delusion*, and therefore clearly only the pursuit of an irrational, and therefore arguably *insane* mind.

But on the contrary, we are pointing out rather that *his* assertion of NO GOD is not scientifically proven, and is therefore not the output of a *rational, scientific mind.*

The only true output of a rational scientific mind is what the fictional *Star Trek's* Mr Spock would say:

DON'T KNOW. INSUFFICIENT DATA CAPTAIN.

So we come back to the question of *why* Richard Dawkins is so insisting there is no God, that is, how can he be so desperately insistent that he is a lump of sod, of no more significance to his *blind, unintelligent* universe than something the dog left on the sidewalk, how can he be so *glad* to furiously deny the only hope that he could

possibly have of defeating the death sentence that has been passed on him at birth, and can be carried out at any moment, any hour or second of the day?

And the very first few words of the preface of his book give us a clue.

He does not get five words into his book before mentioning the words *my wife*, and my god, what a wife this man has, who is none less than *Lalla Ward*, a bona fide "goddess type" woman, who is not only of well connected high aristocratic birth, not very far removed from the British Queen (David Icke *bloodline* fans please note), but was the object of innumerable boys' (and no doubt *mens'* ) fantasies, as being for a time *Romana*, one of the typically gorgeous onscreen partners of the intelligent benevolent humanoid alien known as "the Doctor" in the legendary and long running British sci-fi series *Doctor Who.*

There are a million or more ways to open a book, especially a science one, and apart from a *dedication*, which is a wholly different matter to *the text* of a book, why do we find this man in his "moment of desperate need" – i.e. at the very start of a very tough and difficult book in which he seeks to demolish *every single substantive argument and counter argument* of the whole of the current massive wave of reaction and backlash coming from the religious and would-be religious world of past and present against scientific atheism – introducing his *wife* as some kind of "a proof"?

He says his wife hated school and wanted to leave, but "didn't know she could." He mentions her name, as an obvious sign of affection, and says that he will use *her words* as the subject for his opening text.

Then at the conclusion of the preface he says:

> "Above all, I thank my wife Lalla Ward, who has coaxed me through all my hesitations and self-doubts, not just with moral support and witty suggestions for improvement, but by reading the entire book aloud to me, at two different stages in its development, so I could apprehend very directly how it might seem to a reader other than myself."

When we get beneath the skin – the typically cold and defensive rational exterior – of the average "rational scientist", we find that they are really not rational people at all. What they are is *emotional*. In fact most people in this society, due to poor upbringing – mostly due to weak or absent fathers and dominant alternatively mollycoddling and abusive mothers – are emotional wrecks.

When we say *abusive mothers*, we don't necessarily mean ones who beat the living daylights out of their children, or interfere with their private parts in the way that *men* allegedly carry out abuse.

Oh no, counter to what the feminist media and so on propagandise us with continually, there are forms of abuse that are *far more subtle.* There are the processes of systematic destruction of somebody's mind, of mentally bullying them, unduly exciting them and confusing them, so that they are not clearly "abused" as per a child molester's *physical abuse*, but their minds are systematically made weak and pliable to a dominant seductive influence, and this is the state of the modern average man.

Those who doubt this explanation of how countless women treat *male* children, may well have experienced the same abusive and bullying treatment from the women in their lives *as adults*, so just imagine what they might do to us were we totally naïve and defenceless little children again, and therefore whether we remember it or not, *likely did.*

Incidentally, please don't imagine we are trying to stir up *hate* of women here, we don't think *hate* is the answer to anything, what we are trying to do is awaken *a*

*healthy realism* in men, for them to emerge from their current state of thinking – *is it only ME who experiences this from women?* – and come out of "the closet" and *denial* about the reality of modern women's behaviour, and to validate and possibly even not fear to express their true and *legitimate* feelings about women's sadly disappointing, insecurity driven and sometimes cruel behaviour towards men and children, and indeed in many cases *towards other women*, e.g. all the *nice* girls who get bullied and sometimes driven to suicide by the *not nice girl* gangs of bullies at school, and likely even in the workplace at times.

But though he may have forgotten it, due to growing up with sometimes even a tease and frequently bully for a mother, he is addicted to women. We don't just mean *sex*, which is in one sense no more of an addiction than is the desire to eat, it being an unavoidable biological force rather than a man-made addiction such as gambling or alcoholism.

We mean that he is taking *the ground or foundations of his being* from the spirit of woman. He worships all her mischievous and seductive and even cruel ways – as rock singer *Sting* said "every little thing she does is magic", or as we would rephrase it to make the point clearer: every little thing she does is *hypnotic.*

Women don't necessarily *see* that they are being cruel. They just think that enslaving males is the natural order of things, and that they are legitimately angry and justified in cruel and vengeful treatment if a prospective or actual male slave *won't worship.*

Thus in such a perverse sexual political climate, i.e. that demands the male spirit worship and accept the dominion of the female, a fundamentally *innocent* man like Richard Dawkins opens up his PC or his notebook to express his thoughts, and in that silent moment of anxiety and fear, wondering if writer's block will capture him and halt his writing career in its tracks, and have his name in print no more, receiving honours and plaudits and awards and constantly in demand for TV documentary appearances no more, he hears not the voice of God as prophets allegedly do, but rather just as in the last line of the feminist piece of propaganda we took to pieces and showed ridiculous in our earlier works, *The Da Vinci Code*, he hears the voice of woman, of *his wife.*

(as we have pointed out above, *he himself* says how *she* coaxed *him* though all his doubts and fears – you know, just *why* has he got *any* doubts and fears if he is so sure of his case? Why does he need *a woman* to tell him *he is right* (when you know, actually he is *wrong*)?)

So clearly, in all his bible-bashing and God denying he hasn't noticed that in the book of Genesis, the unknown author of that book told the *allegorical tale* of what happens when man listens to woman and not to his soul, his God: *he falls from paradise.*

Likewise we have the "myth" of Pandora's box, of her box full of woes that she unleashes on society.

Both allegories are merely expressing the social consequences of what happens when men fail to listen to their own intuition, i.e. their "god", and start to listen *only* to women. That is, these fables are "moral" or "psychological" or "gender dynamics" lessons in allegory, just like the story of *The Three Little Pigs* or *The Emperor's New Clothes*, which once again, nobody but a fool would take literally.

We are not saying that all women are evil, any more than are all men. We are saying that there is an egotism in the average woman that seeks to enslave a man, that makes her want to seek to focus all his life and existence and attention upon her, to worship her, and to that situation *God* is a most unwelcome rival. He is the most serious and

number one threat to her *power*, apart from another more seductive or enslaving woman of course (note how there is often this ongoing battle between wives or girlfriends and a man's *mother* for control over him, and how much the girlfriend or daughter-in-law resents the mother or mother-in-law).

Is this your author's imagination, his delusion?

Well, let us recall the words a real life woman once said to your author:

"Women are not meant to be understood, they are meant to be worshipped."

(to which we replied, "No, you are meant to be *understood* (and cared for), *not worshipped* (as if you were a God, instead of just a weak fallible human being just like the rest of us).

But why should she say that, if she didn't believe it to be true?

And she was just an average woman, not especially educated or not so, so why is it not safe to assume that *whether they admit it or not*, most women think that way, or at least have that tendency within them, which *awakens* once a desirable man comes into their sphere, and starts showing attention or even worship to them.

They lap it up.

Men who don't see this and imagine that the girl or woman loves *him* for the person he really is are under a very great delusion indeed.

Oh yes, she loves him *as a subject*, *as a servant, as a slave.*

And it is clear to us from observing the real life relationships of countless men, that is the role they are in. At best, they are "her little boy" whom she takes care of like a mother, but don't forget *mummy knows best.*

We saw this acceptance of woman as teacher in the book *The Bridge of Love* by best selling *Jonathan Livingstone Seagull* author *Richard Bach.*

Women long to find *a talented man*, and mother him, enslave him, and use his talents to foster *her ego*, to reflect his greatness back on herself, and of course to achieve her biological mission of producing children, and having them in the most privileged and secure and respected environment.

We saw this clearly in the case of Heather Mills marrying Paul McCartney, though he was *twenty-six years* her senior, she still sought to enslave, and drag him around to all her animal rights campaigning and so on, and has now turned on him angrily seeking to punish him by publicly savaging him reputation and trying to hurt him as much *financially* as possible, because he has failed to worship her adequately and serve her demands.

She is an angry goddess, displeased with her slave who has rebelled, but of course Paul McCartney, a dollar billionaire, a British knight of the realm, an ex-Beatle and so on, who can likely lift up the telephone and talk to almost any famous person in the world, is consequently used to *getting his own way*, so he was likely not going to put up with it. The goddess has apparently not quite realised that she had married *a greater god*, but she is learning her lesson now.

But most men are not so demanding or used to getting their own way. They are quite happy to serve the goddess, for her to pat him on his head and tell him he's a good boy, and of course when he gets unhappy and confused and afraid, she says "Come here and cuddle up to my warm body, and we'll soon salve those anxieties and worries with a bout of *great sex*."

So we don't mean to be *personal* about Richard Dawkins or indeed anyone else, but sadly he has committed the very serious crime of successfully leading and

condemning millions of educated people into misery and delusion, so we are sorry to say he has made himself fair game for attack.

And his immediate admission of subservience and submission to, worship of and above all *need* of his wife, is necessary to understand when assessing his work.

Because on the psychological level, the explanation of his behaviour, as with countless millions of other men is that there is no god, there is only his wife, because even if there is a God, God clearly doesn't care, whereas *she does.*

Does God come and tuck any of us in at night, does he make us a bed time drink? Does he give us "great sex", does he wear some sexy lingerie for us and excite us out of our minds, doing things to our bodies, and making us forget all our worries and fears – at least for a while?

Does God reach out and kiss us across the breakfast table, does he have a twinkle in his eye as he smiles at us telling us we are a good boy, and hinting that there will be more "rewards" for us, more "paradise" when we get home from our job later that evening once more?

No. If he exists, unlike in the Jim Carrey fantasy movie *Bruce Almighty* he never seems to show up does he? Our real life is more often like what happens to Jim Carrey as the *unmighty Bruce* in question in the first reel – disappointment, humiliation and so on – and unlike in this fantasy movie *remains so.*

Our football team is in the cup final, and for some vague and bizarre reason (in reality, likely a desperate effort to retain our masculinity on some level, our *need* to feel *heroic*) it seems to matter to us more than anything that they win, but when we pray to God, at least half the time our team *does not* win.

We may be in a war torn country, and our family is murdered in front of our eyes, and we pray to him, but again, as far as we have heard he still doesn't show up, he still does not put a hand through the ether and save our skins or those of our parents, or even wipe our tears away.

We ask for a thousand things, from a childhood toy, to a job or career we want, to a girl or boy whom we are infatuated with, and however hard and long we ask, it seems like he grants us almost none of these things, and therefore the few that we *do* get, we can write off to "luck." We generally find that only by crawling across broken glass can we get what we want, and often even then we feel that we do not ever get *what we deserve.*

So where is it? Where is this "ask and it shall be granted"? How can we believe in a God that tells us such outrageous lies, surely the most outrageous of them all being that this God *loves* us?

We have a world full of horror and suffering, with a few isolated lacunae of short-lived happiness amidst the struggle and strife, and our tears have been cried so hard and bitter, and our cries to this God so silently unanswered, that in our agony we long for the only "love" we have ever known, which is the (sometimes) gentle hand and touch of a woman, like the mother we remember from our childhood days.

So the vast majority of men re-surrender to that mother figure in the form of an adult woman, because it's the only kind of "love" they have ever known.

Understandably God is just an unlikely fiction to them, and that is Richard Dawkins' position.

But we are merely pointing out here, that we can clearly see that this decision to declare NO GOD, is not a rational one, it's *an emotional one*, it is the consequence of anger and disappointment with traditional religion and its promises.

Thus in his anger – which of course does not show on the surface of this worldly successful and esteemed man – Richard Dawkins ardently seeks to suppress not only

in his own mind, but hopefully in that of every educated person, any possible notion that there just might conceivably be a god, there might just conceivably be some purpose to man's life other than worshipping women, having sex and making "scientific progress."

His excuse is that religion causes war, but really that's a lame one, especially from an evolutionist who endorses Darwin's theory of *the survival of the fittest*, which philosophy in itself is the fundamental basis of conflict, which inevitably leads to war.

That is, do we imagine for one moment that if there were no religion there would be no war, as he suggests?

The man is barking mad if he thinks that way.

He points out that Hitler believed in God for example, but does he think that it was Hitler's so called "belief in God" which was the cause of World War II, not forgetting the American-Japan war?

Of course it wasn't. Hitler's war was due to injury to his own personal pride, and encouraging the also fallen pride of the German people as a "master race."

Does he think that it was America's belief in God that caused them to drop the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki?

Of course that wasn't the reason. It was simply defence of the homeland, and perhaps some kind of revenge for the aggression and atrocities committed by the Japanese on Pearl Harbour and against the prisoners of war and so on.

The desire for war, for domination, for conquest is the desire of *the ego*, it is the consequence of *ambition*, just as is global domination by capitalism, just as some *little* businessman store owner decides he will be a *big* businessman store owner, and make his single store into a chain of stores, and eventually put one in every city in the world.

Wars would exist with or without religion, and it is the greatest dirty trick of leaders throughout history to use religion as an excuse for one tribe to dominate another, because all *true* founders of all religions – whatever the *propaganda* says – wanted nothing but the same as Christ, who allegedly put a Roman soldier's ear back on after St Peter cut it off with a sword; they all wanted peace, justice and love and brotherhood for *all men.*

DO NOT BELIEVE A WORD OF IT when you hear that Moses, Christ or Mohammed or whoever was a war mongerer who sought only justice for *his own people*. Look at *the books* themselves, or alternatively the actual life stories of these prophets and so on.

We are not saying that in some cases they were not engaged in wars, or even supportive of certain wars, as per the war that is the subject of *the Bhagavad-Gita*, when Lord Krishna actually encourages the hero Arjuna to fight, but only in order to restore *the path of dharma*, of *justice.*

But we do not see that any of our modern wars come into this category of "necessary evil", of *just war*, such as for example, when some aggressive bully or criminal is trying to attack our daughter or wife, and we are quite justified in warring upon him to prevent the evil he is trying to commit, and perhaps even killing him if there is no other way to safely subdue him.

But our modern wars are surely not that clear cut, and we feel are mostly the fault of the mischief makers in power, who do not truly seek peace and justice for the world, but just seek to enhance the status of themselves and their own people, in the as we have put it usual "Darwinist domination" way.

So now let us look at Richard Dawkins' arguments one by one – at least his main ones – and show why they are ridiculous or fallacious in almost every case.

The first laughable thing he says is even in the preface, he claims to be giving *consciousness raising* messages, and we know *he really means it*, he *really believes* that this is what he is doing, such is the awful depth of *his own* delusion.

Whereas what is the truth?

The truth is that in our so-called "civilised society", this "civilisation" is a thin veneer.

Once we take some kind of god out of the equation, men cease to aspire to higher things. They just become fixated on women and sex, material addictions and becoming as greedy and dominant as they can in their particular patch and territory, whether large or small – which of course is exactly what the powerful elite in the world want, so that *no one will oppose them*.

But after first as we have explained *naively* blaming all conflicts on religion – really they are all just tribal domination wars, based on a clearly *Darwinist* rather than religious agenda – Dawkins goes on to praise John Lennon's "magnificent song" *Imagine.*

Well, it's a catchy number there is no question, but if we want to know where the song *Imagine* really came from, or was coming from, we need to understand Lennon's psychology, as we explained to some degree in our *Men's Liberation Guide to Women*.

Lennon was a neglected and therefore *psychologically abused* child. Just when are the feminists and modern psychologists going to accept and admit that *abuse* is not just about fiddling with somebody's sexual bits or giving them black eyes, and that awful as that is, it's not the main element in creating human misery?

The real abuse is destruction of one's spirit, of one's heart and mind.

So John Lennon, though he flirted briefly with "religion" in the form of the Maharishi – there is a famous photograph of The Beatles and their entourage at that time, with Lennon sitting in rapt attention at the feet of the Maharishi – eventually traded his spiritual hope in as a false one and settled into *woman worship*, just as Richard Dawkins himself is presumably in the state of, just as we described in our opening salvo.

For we are really making a kind of mathematical point here. If we want a goddess, she is going to want to be worshipped (she is used to it, since *birth*). Thus if we want her, unless we are some extraordinarily brave man who can *master* her, we are going to have to show due respect and indeed *worship* for her. Hazrat Inayat Khan, an alleged Sufi Saint pointed out in his fascinating *Sufi Message* series, first published in the 1920s, that to gain the cooperation of woman one first had to *fully* satisfy her *vanity.* Looks like things haven't changed much in a hundred years, or maybe even since human history began, doesn't it?

The Imagine *video* clearly shows how Lennon's life was almost wholly dominated by the presence of Yoko Ono.

In Paul McCartney's videos, we saw Linda as *an assistant* who maybe played the occasional note on the keyboard, or shook a tambourine or whatever, but in Lennon's case, he sought increasingly to *fuse his identity* with that of Yoko Ono, to the degree even of having her rather bizarre and comparatively inferior songs and performances on every alternate track of his final album *Double Fantasy.*

The secret of women's power in this respect is *total acceptance* of a man.

Men do not get total acceptance generally speaking from either their fathers or from a supposed God.

They only get *total* acceptance from such a *male authority figure* if they carry out his wishes or "commandments", if they can come up to the standard of Him saying about them as in the rare case of Christ – *this is my son, with whom I am well pleased.*

The woman who owns and enslaves us tells us we are *right*, there is nothing *wrong* with us (as long as we show her enough worship); whereas the God, the priest, the demanding father, tells us to confess *our sins*, and to set ourselves on *the path of righteousness*, or to be less "holier than thou" about it, the path of *justice*, of *honour.*

So naturally, *in our insecurity*, in our addiction to sex and vanity, i.e. status, of our fantasies of what a "big man" we are in the world, as reflected in our achievements, our possessions, our jobs, we reject the priest, we reject the God, and we surrender ourselves to the woman, who both gives us sex and even more importantly *approval* to exist as a sensual self-gratifying, prideful and self-centred being.

So what's wrong with that, most modern men would likely reply?

What's wrong with indulging as freely as one may in sex, and chasing the money and the status, being a big fish or celebrity in this society?

Who in heaven or hell or earth do these religious people and prophets think they are to spoil all our fun?

As cheeky British comedian and writer Ben Elton said in his attack on creationism and the concept of a God generally speaking, whose performance we actually recorded off the TV and included with our earlier works:

"Now *Darwinism* – there's *a cause worth defending.*"

That is, Mr Elton wants to maintain his status as a celebrity, as privileged far above all the ordinary citizens, and who knows, to enjoy sensual and sexual pleasures that the average citizen once again has little or no access to, so he doesn't want any religion saying "thou shalt not do this, that or the other" mucking his plans up.

And as we saw (or heard) in this performance, as usual, he achieves this by pandering to and worshipping women, by complaining that if there was a God, because of the cruelties he has "unintelligently designed" upon women such as the menstrual cycle and the alleged awful pain of childbirth, he must surely be *a man*, bringing tumultuous applause of course from the numerous never-satisfied, insecure and unloved and immature women in his audience, of which of course they are many in *any* audience in the Western world.

(whereas, you know, if childbirth is really so awfully painful, we are astounded that women *ever* want any more children after the first, when now unlike in Victorian days or whatever they have *the choice*, but we see women *choosing* to get pregnant time and time again, despite knowing they will once again have to endure this allegedly awful agony, which makes us think that in most cases, the lady *protests too much* and it's yet more feminist propaganda to make men grateful for even being alive and not having to suffer like a woman does – which again you know, makes it puzzling why about four times as many men as woman are committing suicide, if womens' lives are truly so awful, difficult and painful).

So we are all being conned.

We are being encouraged to imagine that men like Richard Dawkins are true scientists who have convincing evidence that their atheistic views are correct, but the truth is, they are only *psychologically speaking* little boys who are worshipping at mummy's breasts, and accepting her pats on the head for approval, and urging that no nasty God is going to get in the way of their "glorious future" in the world, and come

between they and their glorious sensual and childishly emotional "love" for one another.

We can see the sort of thing that is going on between men and women in modern Western society in the famous *Camillagate* tapes, in which some snoop was able to record intimate phone conversations between Camilla and Prince Charles, which though we feel was a wrongful infringement of their privacy, by it being unwillingly thrust in all our faces at least gave us some psychological material to better understand the modern man-woman relationship with.

Not that we dislike either Charles or Camilla, as we have said in our earlier works, we find them far preferable to most of the other royals, including the highly vain and attention seeking Princess Diana, whom though we certainly never wished death upon, and felt sympathy for as yet another abused woman, was a really very bad role model to women worldwide, with *her own* histrionic behaviour, neglect of her children to boarding school and openly confessed extra-marital affairs, who in our view married Charles in the first place *for all the wrong reasons* (i.e. mostly as a *guaranteed ticket to fame and celebrity*).

Or we see similar in the case of world famous footballer and "fashion icon" David Beckham, who allegedly wore his wife's underwear, and sported even on the soccer field a female like "Alice band" in his hair, and adopted other unduly feminine traits, which incidentally collectively speaking may have explained the fury of his ex-manager Sir Alex Ferguson at him, allegedly throwing a boot at him in the dressing room, likely frustrated with his prima donna like and *unmasculine* (in the traditional sense) behaviour.

[incidentally we note that the Microsoft spellchecker objects to the word *unmasculine*, with a little red "wrong" line underneath, as if the whole concept of "masculinity" or "unmasculinity" didn't exist, whereas it raises no such object to the word "unfeminine." Try it for yourself. Thus do we see how even in the smallest aspects of *modern* life, the male identity is being systematically undermined.]

Incidentally, David Icke points out that the secret elite of the world – whoever they may be – do not want people believing in a God, because such a *true* belief would make them like a good number of the Muslims *without fear*, and therefore *not easily enslavable*, thus do we likely see the *real* cause of the war on the Arab/Muslim world, just as the likes of *The Da Vinci Code* is attacking "traditional religion" in the West – i.e. in both cases, the agenda is the destruction of *religious faith.*

A bunch of liberal consumerist hedonists and sensualists, hooked on sex and fashion and mindless modern pop music are childishly easy to manipulate. Thus the big bosses of the world want people like those, and want the religious people neutered, ridiculed, destroyed.

But we were debating why if there is a God he should be so "cruel" and so on, as appears, him not doling out his praise to us left, right and centre, and materialising out of thin air all our wishes.

So we are not going to pretend to be an all knowing oracle, but we are going to offer a general theory based on our own admittedly limited personal experience, but also that of numerous other first hand accounts and eye-witness reports throughout history, which include the life of Christ and his apostles, that of Buddha, and also modern (i.e. 20th Century or later) figures like Hazrat Inayat Khan, J Krishnamurti, the Maharishi, David Icke and "kundalini guru" Gopi Krishna, who wrote his first hand accounts of his own experiences in fine and clear English in the latter half of the 20th century.

The fact of the matter is that to some extent the Darwinist biological evolutionary theories are right.

But they all fall down on an essential point. Which is that they see the path of evolution as due to some blind, random forces (Richard Dawkins' *blind watchmaker*), rather than the workings of a cosmic intelligence, a *purposeful* power of Nature, which is of infinite intelligence, and not some ridiculous and immature anthropomorphic concept of God as some whimsical and likely perverted and cruel guy with a white beard hovering in the clouds somewhere.

Really, this *is* about as far as the average modern scientist actually gets in his or her contemplation of an alleged *cosmic intelligence* that animates every particle or alternatively put, *orchestrates every wave and vibration* in the universe *effortlessly.*

We are not static beings. The race is evolving still slowly in most cases in terms of its *intelligence*, its power of mind and brain.

The incredibly sudden scientific awakening of the last two to five hundred years is not due to some accident, it is because *we are evolving, we are awakening, we are getting more intelligent.*

Or why did it take so many tens or hundreds of thousands of years to even discover how to make fire, and then thousands of years to make bronze, and iron, and so on, why was this process so slow?

It wasn't chance. Most of the discoveries of the modern world were made by *a very small number of very mentally capable people.*

Those like Newton, Einstein, Kepler, Euler, Gauss, Edison and so on and their counterparts in the arts such as Bach, Beethoven, Leonardo, Shakespeare, Van Gogh, Rembrandt, Picasso, Dali and so on have made our modern world, such as it is, and it is a world that has been created by *a very few people* in the population at the upper echelons of the intelligence brackets.

Sadly, this great scientific and technological power that has been unleashed by the few has been exploited by a rather less high minded elite, and *there* lies our problem, there lies man's *fallen crown.*

So as we have said till we are nearly blue in the face, the prophets, i.e. "religious leaders" did not come to spoil anybody's fun.

On the contrary they came to save us *from ourselves.*

You know, "Jesus saves", he doesn't *enslave* like our modern leaders do.

But we have been conned like Richard Dawkins into seeing this modern corrupt version of "religion", with its greedy "money changers in the temple" "Jesus wants you to give us your money till it hurts" bible-thumping preachers and *sometimes* sexually deviant priests, as the totality of what religion is about, and therefore a disgraceful thing, a thing only to be ridiculed and stamped out of society as an abhorrent monstrosity to be exterminated.

So what do we mean, "save us from ourselves"?

i.e. in the mischievous and in our view poor taste song *Gloria* the lady (well, kind of) songstress sings:

> "Jesus died for somebody's sins, but *not mine.*
> My sins are *my own*, they belong to me."

Well, that one is nearly up there with *The Vagina Monologues* as some kind of license to be a sexually self-obsessed "orgasm huntress", which when put into a social sexual context translates as *slut*.

i.e. modern men have been conned into accepting modern women's *right* to be sluts, sleeping around with Tom, Dick and Harry, which once again is not merely against "moral" or "religious laws", but against every man's *natural biological instincts*,

because he wants to know *his children are his own*, this is really very simple Darwinistic "survival of the fittest" logic, which we wonder why Richard Dawkins does not bother to *ever* point out, but ah, we know the answer already why he doesn't. He doesn't dare say anything "bad" about women, *ever*.

*That* is the apparently *only* "commandment" in this modern "godless" world.

Please observe this in all the media, in all the newspaper articles and TV debates and interviews. Please observe how though one can say whatever one likes (in the West) about Mohammed or God or *men*, one can categorize all three of the above as being dirt, the scum of the earth, items of ridicule – we can see clearly for example in the Swedish cartoons how this right is being *demanded, vociferously fought for* – everybody must tip toe as if on egg shells around anything to do with the status or rights of women. All one is allowed to do as regards women is heap lavish (i.e. *slavish*) praise upon them.

We must worship women for their astounding and amazing beauty (even though you know, it's our personal experience that they get acne, have bad breath, vomit after binge drinking, and make bad smells from time to time in the toilet just as men do).

We must worship them for their heroic courage in giving birth to children, and enduring the awful torment of period pains (you know, as we have said, womens' lives are such endless *agony* and torment that we are just amazed they are not committing suicide in droves (you know, like modern *men* are) because they just can't take the pain any more).

We must worship them for their superior intelligence, we must give them all jobs in preference over men, because women must be empowered, we need a woman's touch in the world to set things aright, *so they tell us*.

Well, have we tried looking at *reality* for a change?

Have we seen how the more and more women who are getting into power in every branch of society – law, politics, the police, and so on – the more we have a dictatorial, totalitarian and undemocratic world, in which power is centralised and even free speech is denied, and in particular, *children are neglected.*

For instance, we are told we can now have free speech *unless it offends anyone.*

Can we be forgiven for *not* laughing out loud?

It's so awful, laughter is no longer adequate, it's far too serious for that.

Can these people not understand – the right to *offend* others is exactly what free speech is all about?

Did not Ben Elton needlessly *offend* us with his talk of womens' vaginas and period pains and mocking God? Did not the anti-Muslim cartoons needlessly offend so many Muslims of the 1.4 billion of them worldwide?

Just because we have *the right* to free speech, does not mean that we necessarily *use it*.

In a truly civilised society, people have *the unlimited right* to free speech, but they have *the humanity*, the commonsense, the wisdom to not *abuse* that right.

It is only in a draconian intolerant society *such as we have got* that people try to control our rights to say things, whimsically giving the right to one group such as the anti-religious lobby like Richard Dawkins, who clearly is offending *billions* with his "free speech", who regardless of whether it is true or not seek to believe or merely *thoroughly explore the possibility* that they just *might* be something more than a lump of soon decaying excrement.

So is your author *offended* by Dawkins enforcing the commandment upon us all with his *very loud trumpet*:

THERE SHALT NOT BE A GOD?

Not at all. We are not at all *offended* by him saying such. He has free speech, he has every right to state his view.

What we *are* offended by, is that he is claiming to be *a rational scientist*, someone who bases their case *exclusively* on incontestable, rationally concluded evidence.

And of this, he of course has *none.*

Likewise Darwin does not threaten the concept of a God. The only people he threatens are those who believe the world was created in 4004BC or whatever, and that Adam was delivered under a dock leaf.

It is not in our *origin* that the real question is, except in *the ultimate sense*, of the *totally unanswered by science* question of the origin not merely of *species,* but *of life itself.*

It is man's *destiny*, not his *origin* that sets us apart from the rest of the animal kingdom, who have let us say fallen into "evolutionary dead ends."

That is – is a bee or a goat ever going to get "enlightenment" like the Buddha or whoever allegedly did? Is it ever going to write a play like Shakespeare or compose a symphony like Beethoven, or invent a theory of relativity like Einstein?

Of course not.

*That* is the difference. We are on a different plane of *consciousness*, of *intelligence* than the rest of the animal kingdom, and the *scientific* question we should all be asking, is just what is *our destiny*.

Are we *also* in an evolutionary dead end?

*To be something more*, or *not to be* something more?

THAT is *the question.*

So Douglas Adams apparently was at least an acquaintance of Richard Dawkins, Dawkins having written Adams a fan letter, met him and had his aforementioned wife introduced to him by Adams, the latter having met her whilst working on the *Dr Who* series.

And no doubt this allegedly "special relationship" led RD (we will sometimes call Mr Dawkins from now on to avoid undue repetition) to quote from the sadly now deceased Douglas Adams in the following way:

'Isn't it enough to see that a garden is beautiful without having to believe that there are fairies at the bottom of it too?'

But we would like to ask a different though more relevant question of RD, which is:

Isn't it enough to have a garden (i.e. *the Universe*) that is beautiful without having to have *humans* (or for that matter *little green men*) at the bottom of it too?

Because as kundalini guru Gopi Krishna points out, the problem that mankind faces, is not its evolutionary origin, but *its consciousness.*

A wiser being than your author once asked a crowd of listeners *what is the difference between the rest of the animal kingdom and man*?

And nobody could answer.

And the wise being said "It is *the ability to complain*."

We are a race or species of whingers and whiners, whereas the rest of the animal kingdom *just gets on with it.*

Admittedly a bear that gets its paw clamped diabolically in a hunter's trap certainly howls arguably with *complaint*, but humans complain even about things which aren't there. They complain because they think *there is a God* (but either he's a despot, or he simply doesn't care about us and in our time of need doesn't show up). Or they

complain because they think there *isn't* a God, like Mr Dawkins, because they are annoyed with the people who think *there is.*

Humans complain about pretty much *everything*. To use an old joke they even complain that *nostalgia ain't what it used to be.*

So what's it all about, this complaining?

It is in theory at least about so called *free will*, and at most, it is the spirit of discontent that makes us *evolve and grow*, that makes us seek and reach for something better, and for *something higher.* If we were content merely with eating, breathing and mating – which undoubtedly it appears a great many humans *are* – we would never rise to anything greater, our current complex social and technological society would simply not exist.

Our personal view which coincides with the Maharishi's, and also Gopi Krishna's, is that in the *subjective* sense there *is* free will, but in the ultimate objective sense *there isn't*, that ultimately all is *cause and effect.*

But everything is so complicated, the course of action, of *cause and effect* is as the Bhagavad-Gita says *unfathomable.*

If we toss the silver ball into the roulette wheel and give it a good spin, unless there are some hidden magnets or whatever, it's pretty much beyond any of us and even the best available modern computer simulations to tell us with any certainty what numbered slot that ball will finish up in when the wheel slows, and the centrifugal force no longer keeps the ball pinned to its sides.

But if all is *cause and effect*, then to know what the effect is, we have to know what is *the cause*.

And in spiritual or religious terms, the cause is – working through the laws of Nature of course – *the cause of all causes,* or *the cosmic intelligence, the cosmic author or playwright*, and *composer and conductor* of the cosmic symphony, also known as *God.*

But of course, Mr Dawkins and his kind say it is simply all about the spinning roulette wheel, it is only cause and effect to the extent that the outcome is governed totally by *chance*, by *statistical probability*.

And of course this is "the black box" that is thrown over *reality*, over *the origin of life*, and so scientists argue over probabilities. Some say this bodily organ such as the human eye or whatever could not have evolved in such a short space of time, the odds are *too great*, they are some incredible number with an awful lot of noughts after the first figure.

And then RD and his comrades say, "Nonsense, these are statistically plausible events."

And who can answer that?

For example, who can calculate *the probability of life occurring* on any given planet where there is enough oxygen, carbon and so on in x billion years?

When we don't know *how* life was created, clearly there is no way to assess how likely it was that it can or will be created in any time scale on any planet anywhere in the universe. All we know for a fact is that *it exists here.*

What we need are some very able mathematicians to hook up with some very well informed biologists or geneticists to assess the maths of these issues, but we seriously doubt whether such "research" could ever be *conclusive* or moreover *accepted*, at least in the foreseeable future.

But make no mistake these questions are absolutely crucial to answer. They could be critical to our whole survival. Our world could be compared to an enormous computer program with billions of subroutines all running simultaneously, but there

are *bugs* in this program, and the system is going to *crash* soon if these bugs don't get sorted out, and right now all we are arguing about is *the bugs.*

Dawkins says we have got a computer virus, a "virus of faith" that is going to bring the system down, and must be deleted or at the very least *quarantined.*

And the rest of us are arguing, no, this is no *virus*, this is a fundamental core process in the system *in need of repair* you are mistaking for a virus, without which the whole system will not run and all the files will get wiped out, because then the *real viruses* will be able to run amok on the hard drive of the world, i.e. those of out of control capitalism, and addictions to sex, gambling, drugs, undue greed for material things, neglect of the poor, starving, old and needy and so on.

Thus while this *vital* debate hangs in the air, in the absence of any morals coming from religion, the whole world falls apart and looks ready to destroy itself in any number of ways – and as we have repeatedly pointed out, all that *morals* are about are sticking to a few basic rules (*Moses' commandments* for example) like having one wife each (at least *at a time*) and not interfering with anybody else's wife or children, and as Christ said, generally speaking giving *respect* and *equal rights* to one's neighbour, so that we can have a *civilised society* instead of the chaotic, abusive, criminal, homicidal, genocidal and even gender-cidal (currently against *men*) one that we have got now.

For example, in RD's preface he quotes from someone named Philip E Johnson, apparently an "intelligent design" enthusiast, whose words though quoted out of context in the following manner, RD says he endorses 100%:

> 'Darwinism is the story of humanity's liberation from the delusion that its destiny is controlled by a power higher than itself.'

Our point is, if it isn't *God* that creates man's destiny, it is certainly *Nature*. Man is helpless before the awesome power of Nature, whether it's the alleged "supervolcanoes" that can wipe a continent out, or the "fire from on high" that is lightning, which can fry any of us to a crisp if we are in the wrong place at the wrong time, and then there's earthquakes, hurricanes, tsunamis, asteroids from outer space, flares from the sun or changes in its structure which could cause it to engulf the earth *permanently* in millions of degrees of temperature and flames, and then RD is endorsing some kind of idea that we are in some sense in control of our destiny?

And this is the guy who condemns fairies, but he believes in the idea that man might be in control of his destiny, in this never-before-in-human history so out of control world, with its epidemics of crime, disease, pollution, war, genocide, and nuclear and biological weapons enough to wipe us all off the planet many times over.

Thus, we see once again we have not the mind of a rational scientist as is claimed, but a mind that is as deeply or more so lost in fantasies of false empowerment as any dogmatic religious zealot, who may believe in every word of his or her holy book handed down across centuries or millennia, even though there is no definite way of now knowing with any certainty what the prophet or founder of the particular religion actually did or said.

No, once again, this is simply some psychological wishful thinking. It is *protest, rebellion* against *the very idea* that there could be some kind of *parent in the sky* who is pulling all our strings, and saying "thou shalt do this" or "thou shalt not do that."

Whereas, the truth as we see it, based on our own personal experience which we have *to some extent* detailed in our earlier work *Kundalini – A Personal Experience*, as well as we have said of the numerous prophets and saints and even modern "seers"

(to some degree) such as David Icke, is that *we are evolving*, and the scientists do not notice, because it is *the evolution of the brain*, and the scientists don't understand the brain, they freely admit.

i.e. they can't tell the difference *in intelligence* comparing an Einstein's brain to an "idiot's", in terms of for example measured IQ, as indeed neither can they do such a comparison between a woman and man's brain, or for that matter between that of an adult and a child.

And this *more evolved brain* as found in the likes of Van Gogh and geniuses like the mathematician who was the subject of the movie *A Beautiful Mind*, needs a *gentle* world to evolve in or else as in both these cases we lose our balance, the evolution of the brain goes wrong, or at least is accompanied by torment.

We are going to a higher place, like some more advanced race we might imagine shown fictionally in science fiction movies and TV series like *Star Trek* and so on.

In one sense, *Mr Spock* was the most truly *human* character in that particular series, because he had all his feelings, yet restrained himself, tried to live according to reason.

In the series Mr Spock's depicted lack of emotion or suppression of emotion was depicted as *a weakness*, but we are really not so sure this was correct.

As we have elsewhere pointed out, this society is one that is being encouraged to wallow in emotion, and if we give it a little *rational* thought, we will see that likely the vast majority of emotions currently on display are *destructive ones.*

Uncontrolled desires make us all mutual enemies. We all want the same things, but logically we can't all have them. If we can't control our passion for a woman who is in relationship with somebody else we might end up committing rape or murder or at minimum adultery, due to such out of control passion.

The prophets like Moses and Christ were just pointing out that we are pretty dangerous beings at this point in the human evolution, and we need not only protecting from one another, but even from *ourselves.*

Hence the *necessity* for *commandments*, *laws.*

But as we were saying, we are evolving and this new sensitive being needs a gentle, peaceful world, it needs the world of "peace and love" that was advocated so enthusiastically in the 1960s, but where the 1960s and subsequent decades went wrong, is that *true* peace and love cannot be had without some self-discipline, some self-restraint, some self-denial, i.e. without putting *a limit* on our desires.

And we are alleging that not only has sex to be limited to a *moderate* level, as the kundalini explanation of life demonstrated in the life of Gopi Krishna amongst many others, we have to be controlled somewhat like Mr Spock *in our emotions* or else we unbalance our mental health. The ongoing evolutionary development of our brain *throughout our own lifetime* goes wrong.

So we know that the many unwitting scientists who may sooner or later read these words may be aghast at our claim, that we are all evolving *albeit slowly* on a continuous basis, in terms of our brains.

Therefore we have here and there made a suggestion to them and others, to actually test this theory out, i.e. that at the very least, we can by *moderating* (please, not *denying completely* as this could be dangerous or damaging for some) our sexual behaviour, and noting how over a period of time our energy and creativity and hence "intelligence" may actually increase or improve.

And even in the short term, we have pointed out they will see an increasing frequency of the appearance of *morning erections*, which once again careful observation will reveal to them are frequently *not* caused by *either* sexual dreams, or

the urgent need to urinate, though of course it *could* at times coincide with those events, but as we have said, many times is *not* caused by those things.

Rather it is generally the sign and symptom of natural *reverse flow of sexual energy up the spinal cord to the brain*, enlivening and invigorating it and to some degree evolving it.

We are not being dogmatic here. But as we have said in our other works on Kundalini we have given more information supporting this case, so we are not going to repeat it here.

Briefly, we will just point out that if a man restrains his sexual activity even for a few days, he should see a more frequent appearance of the morning erection when he awakens. If he has sexual activity immediately prior to sleep, he will find this appears less so, or not at all.

Your author has observed this phenomenon in himself now over a period of years, *since he became aware of the underlying mechanism.*

We must as always warn those who may actually carry out such a small experiment and find *it is true*, not to shout out "Eureka!" and get excited about it, because they must realise by regulating the flow of unused sexual energy to the brain, they are effectively playing with brain chemistry and physiology, which can be dangerous, in *some* cases more dangerous than even if we play around with hard drugs. Thus we have given warnings against people indulging in *tantric sex* practices, playing around with "chakra energies" and so on, which though may have their value under the supervision of *a true master*, we feel it unlikely any modern "new ager" has enough *authentic* information and expertise regarding to employ safely.

Gopi Krishna's advice was to do what feels natural sexually speaking without being an addict, just to be *moderate*, to avoid *extremes* of behaviour in this regard. Briefly, he recommended sex two to three times per week or fortnight as of optimum value and desirability for most adults.

In time, if Gopi Krishna is proven correct, as appears to be the case to us, it will be seen to be laughable that any man *dare* call himself a biologist who is unaware of and unconversant with this kundalini mechanism, which is currently either unknown or rejected or mocked by modern science, out of some arrogant idea like RD's delusion that humans might be "in control of their destiny" when the reality is we can't even cure the common cold, even less prevent some vagrant comet or asteroid hurtling at us some day from outer space, as in the modern horror "reality movies" *Deep Impact* and *Armageddon*.

Or does anybody really think that in such a scenario we can send out Bruce Willis or Tom Cruise or whoever in a rocket full of hydrogen bombs to save us all?

Next in his book, RD tries to convince the rational *agnostics* (i.e. those of us not *one hundred percent certain* of their "opinions" or "beliefs" or less so) that the God insisters were deluded in trying to sign up Einstein and other famous scientists to the position of "religious belief."

Well, we aren't going to run through the whole history of science, but for example he implies Einstein is an atheist who merely refers to God now and then as a kind of "metaphor" but doesn't actually *believe* in him. Well, really?

For how is it then that we get a quote from Einstein like this in a public conference in direct response to a question from a Rabbi:

"I believe in the God of Spinoza who reveals himself in the orderly balancing of what exists, not in a God who concerns himself with the fates and actions of human beings." ?

So this may not be exactly the Christian God of the New Testament, but it is an *intelligent designer*, nonetheless.

That is, Einstein as a great scientist cannot accept that the obvious design in nature can be produced by random chance, he cannot accept a "blind watchmaker" who if he cannot even see to avoid blundering into the next lamp post certainly cannot have the dexterity and vision to create *a man*, a *human being*, or indeed a star or a galaxy.

And we ask most seriously are these modern so called "scientists" like Dawkins actually genuine and *great scientists*, did they actually make some really very big discovery like Einstein or Newton, or other genuine geniuses like Edison or great founding father mathematicians Carl Friedrich Gauss, or Euler, both of whom were allegedly deeply religious people?

It is rarely *the great* who have denied God, or at least *the possibility* of God existing. It is on the contrary, the mediocre, the discontent, those who lack harmony in their own being, and thus feeling short-changed and mistreated by "the divine" seek to deny it at all, thus imposing a morbid injustice on the great also, by the implication that we will be all equal *at death.*

Next Dawkins talks of the natural "quasi-mystical reverence" that so many scientists have for Nature.

But the man has missed the point. He doesn't know what *the real* thing is. He takes the *mystical vision* of true mystics to be an *emotional experience.*

He gives us images of those scientists, even female ones, who will cry at the sight of animals or the dawn or a range of mountains.

But many people, and in particular many women will cry at *anything.*

The reason is not that they are having a mystical vision. The reason is they are *emotionally unstable.*

When people are emotionally insecure, spiritually barren, they seek *escape.* For some it is alcohol, drugs and sex, and for others it can even be *science.* It can be their collection of bees, butterflies or even laboratory animals that they *emotionally attach to* and can cry buckets over in a sentimental kind of way, just as many people are likely far too emotionally involved with their pets, and on a similar wave of emotional escapism can even become animal rights activists who seem to value animal life and suffering far above human life.

That is, we are not *for* the unnecessary clubbing to death of baby seals or whatever, but that doesn't mean we think it's OK to start terrorising the human population in general if they dare to buy a seal skin coat or whatever, we feel that these problems must be dealt with *holistically.*

i.e. for example, if we want to stop fur traders wiping out species, then we have to find them a better alternative way *to make a living and meet their needs.*

There may even be instances when there is *no alternative* to using animal products as the Indians did, basing their whole existence on the buffalo.

We may find that our synthetic technologies are too damaging to the human organism *and environment* to replace the natural ones, which in many cases are animal-based.

Those who think that we can all survive without any animal products, should be given for a while the job of feeding, clothing and housing *six billion people*, and held accountable for the outcome.

It's all too easy to blame others for what they do, but if we want people to change their behaviours, the only civilised way to do it, is to find them an acceptable *better way.* Again, this is what Richard Dawkins utterly fails to do, in that he offers us *no*

*acceptable alternative to the offer of eternal life and the end to human suffering*, as the prophets *all* do.

He has got himself a goddess for a wife, though frankly not too many other people have got the same, so perhaps that is why *he* is satisfied with his one way ticket to Boot Hill, never to rise again, but perhaps we should ask him about that once again when he is on his death bed, if he still is such a confirmed atheist, when he finally has to come out of denial, and confront his awful fear – as must we all – in the face of this great and supremely scary unknown.

But as we were saying in any case, he has not understood mystical experience, the state of *knowing* experienced by not only the prophets and saints and gurus but many other lesser people, like our Dr R M Bucke who expressed his experiences in the 1901 work *Cosmic Consciousness*, long before the modern era of the "New Agers."

This state of *knowing* experienced by *true mystics* as opposed to the fake *emotional mystic claimants* is reported to essentially differ in that the true mystic or temporary resident in a "higher conscious" state, such as with Buddha's enlightenment or Bucke's brief awakening is that they have the *experience* (as opposed to *idea*) that Nature is the product of *meaning, of purpose, of intelligence*, i.e. that it is the product of a matchless *intelligent designer.*

This is once again why Dawkins and the rest have to write off *all* spiritual and religious experience as nonsense, because these experiences *alone* give a clear signal that *they are deeply and terribly wrong.*

Why do we say *terribly* wrong?

Because, once this experience is denied, i.e. that God *finally showed up* in the mind of some *deserving* being, yet the scientists furiously deny it or ridicule it, they then condemn six billion tortured souls to *living without hope.*

Then we get the society we have got now, full of emotionally unbalanced and undisciplined people living in denial, causing havoc whatever they do and wherever they go, because the holy music, the hymn sheet, has been lost.

There is no conductor or sheet music to tell the orchestra what to do anymore, and it simply results in chaos, in *cacophony*, which as we have said elsewhere, we actually see reflected even in much of our modern jarring, dissonant and overstimulating pop, jazz and classical music.

Then Dawkins goes on to say we have to be wary of opening up this concept of *God*, such that it is not just a limited little anthropomorphic "Old Testament" flat earth kind of God, to the *dangerous* (as he sees it) concept that this God could be an all inclusive cosmic intelligence *as indeed we do see it*, and then even perhaps become – horror of horrors, look out below – *scientifically acceptable.*

On the contrary, he says that God *must* be confined to the idea of a supernatural (and therefore *impossible*) being whom we are supposed to bow down and worship.

You know, that is, we have to *keep God in his place*, i.e. as a perennially laughable and contemptible concept, as the myth of some kind of a tyrant whose only pleasure in life is to inflict needless rules and regulations and torment upon human souls, and send people to "hell" if they won't obey his unjust and puritanical rules.

That is, Dawkins as we have previously explained in our earlier work, *Kundalini - Preventing the Apocalypse* is trying to "trap" God in an outdated "anthropomorphic" role, as the childishly immature vision of the guy with the white beard on a throne hurling down thunderbolts and fire and brimstone at sinners, *lest God slip through the net of his fears and objections and be accepted.*

Please understand, this is what Dawkins wants above all:

*That no concept of a God ever be accepted.*

So he really wants to give us all *no freedom to believe*, he wants to deny our basic right to try to understand our own existence. He cries out "Only SCIENCE has the answers!", whereas we have clearly pointed out in our earlier book *What Is Intelligence?* in the last chapter *based on a verbatim science journal article in the esteemed British journal New Scientist*, that science freely *confesses* that it *doesn't* have the final answers to *any* of the fundamental questions of our existence or the nature or existence of the Universe, and in fact a whole lot of other vital question such as *what is the purpose of sleep*, or *what is the purpose of sex*, which *are* actually within its remit, and it therefore *ought* to find the answer to, and we have in fact given answers to based on the new (though ancient) slowly developing *science of kundalini.*

But let us leave *kundalini* aside for the present, and just deal with more of what Dawkins says on his own merit.

An especially sneaky little argument of Dawkins is that scientists like Einstein and Stephen Hawking don't use the term *God* as most of us understand it, but as just a synonym or metaphor for the laws of Nature.

Well Mr Dawkins, our question to you then is:

*Why the blazes do they use it at all, if they are really atheists as you claim, when it so very easily could be misunderstood*?

We feel the real truth, is that to anyone who is not in a state of denial and paranoia, the idea that there is a God is more or less *self-evident*, and this is why even these "great scientists" easily slip into this habit, because it actually reflects *their inner beliefs*, regardless of outward denials.

It's not so much the *existence* of a cosmic intelligence that is hard to accept, it is just *the motives* of this God that are *the mystery*.

But RD does not accept this position and then says when Einstein said things like "God does not play dice" we should translate that as him meaning "Randomness does not lie at the heart of all things."

Well, we certainly should. But why does he have to bring *God* into it in the first place?

As far as your author is concerned, the very fact that *randomness does not lie at the heart of all things* means that there *is* a *purposeful* ordering of the Universe, there *is* a direction not only to the arrow of time, but to *the human evolution*, which means the underlying Nature of the universe *is intelligence, is purpose.* And in your author's view *cosmic intelligence + purpose = God* by almost anybody's definition.

What Dawkins does not acknowledge is that he is terminally addicted to the concept of an anthropomorphic God as the only possibility of a God *who concerns himself with human affairs.*

This is the thinking of an unimaginative mind, and one that certainly has not taken the trouble to seriously contemplate any genuine mystical literature.

That is, if God exists, he is not some guy who makes the Universe one day, and then goes and lies on the beach.

Do not these terminal anthropomorphists like Dawkins understand?

He *is* the beach, he *is* every proton and electron and quark or whatever in Dawkins' own brain, and in yours and mine.

The idea that we are *separate* beings from *Him*, is just another anthropomorphic illusion, based on our inability to understand the apparent infinity of space and time, and a being that is omnipresent and omnipotent and can therefore function eternally without human weakness, moodiness, tiredness or the need for sleep.

And then to imagine that this all seeing omnipresence is *unaware* of or *unrecognising* of any of our human impulses, even of the most fleeting kind is clearly

utterly ridiculous, it is utterly inconsistent with any concept of an infinitely powerful and ever present being.

Likewise, is it ridiculous to consider that this God is *judgmental*, as our human parents may be, and as are humans in general, any more than we would be judgmental on the sexual or moral behaviour of a dog or a cat.

If God exists, God *is* the universe. As scriptures of all kinds say *God is everywhere, God is everything.*

So if we imagine we can commit some *sin* somewhere, do something "naughty" that we aren't supposed to do, how can we imagine that the power that animates our every atom cannot *know* what we do?

But as we have said, to imagine that He is judging us as another human would, like one of our human parents, is a foolish and baseless assumption, as he surely knows what every proton and electron in us is going to do before it even happens, or how else can he be all powerful and omniscient?

It is thus wrongful and wishful thinking to imagine that this "watchmaker" is blind, because that is what guilty people like Mr Dawkins want to believe, hoping that he doesn't exist, and won't therefore see their "sins."

That is, we are saying the concepts of "sin" and so on are rather outdated. They were made for primitive people in primitive times, and that is why it is grossly unscientific and unjustified to condemn the teachings of prophets in days when the world was still believed to be flat, and no Copernicus or Plato let alone Darwin had yet come into being, nor a Leeuwenhoek with his microscope to show us all the little bugs we never otherwise would have believed were living and floating in a droplet of water.

But not appreciating and contemplating this, and fearing "the wrath of the Lord", let's *confine God to an ignorant past* is Richard Dawkins' greatest desire.

The trouble is, we don't get "the wrath of the Lord", but *the cause and effect wrath of Nature*, i.e. the *impersonal* working of God's laws of Nature, *if we ignore his prophets*, as is being done.

i.e. the prophets all came to tell us *man's suffering is of his own making.* All he has to do is follow a few simple commandments, a few simple rules, show a bit of moderation and restraint, and everything will be all right. The world will quickly turn into a paradise.

But Richard Dawkins says *no.* We are masters of our own destiny. We need no gods, we will be our own gods.

But it is not so childish or irrelevant to look at Jim Carrey's brief outing as *God*, in the *Bruce Almighty* movie, as though obviously this is a somewhat light-hearted entertainment, like so many fables and fairy tales it has some lessons and truths in it for us.

That is, Carrey's fictional character *Bruce* complains about his miserable lot in life and blames *God*, who as we have said *never shows up when he's wanted.*

But in this story at least, God *does* show up, and tells Bruce he is rather tired of his complaints, and offers him the power of God for a while to see if he can do a better job.

And what does Bruce do with this almighty power, hence *The Bruce Almighty*?

He selfishly satisfies all his desires, he takes vengeance on all his enemies, ousts them from the jobs he enviously desires and replaces them and so on. It is quite amusing and well done, when for example as a reporter he has various disasters happen such as an asteroid hitting the earth behind his back, so he can be "right on the scene" as the "star reporter."

Then God comes and asks him what *good* he has done with his power, and he has to confess *zero.*

And our feeling is that is pretty much what human beings tend to do with *great power* also.

In the end Bruce finds that although he can do anything with his unlimited material power, even give his girlfriend fantastic orgasms, what he cannot do is:

a) make his girlfriend love him
b) create a peaceful and harmonious society

And once again, we feel that is pretty much the situation of modern man. As we pointed out, the likes of Emperor Crassus from the movie *Spartacus* – a real life Roman incidentally, not merely a fiction – can rule the people with an iron fist, he can conquer the world, but he cannot necessarily get a good woman to love him, and he certainly cannot make his people happy, even were that his intent, which of course it wasn't.

So in the end, having caused havoc in society with his powers and lost his woman by failing to understand and acknowledge her needs, Bruce cries out *to God*, saying he can't take it any more, he can't cope with this power, he needs *guidance from on high.*

And this really is the psyche of Richard Dawkins and the modern world in general. It is a society of "prodigal sons" and "prodigal daughters" all living vainly, egotistically, imagining they are wise enough to conduct the running of their own lives, and of society and the planet, whereas all we see before us just like our fictional *Bruce Almighty*, is what *another fine mess they are getting us into* as Oliver Hardy of brilliant tragic-comedy duo *Laurel and Hardy* used to say.

If God exists, he is not "interfering" as it were, he is watching eternally and silently, and he sends his prophets out to tell man what to do, but they don't listen, and then the consequences are just *cause and effect.*

That is, we can look at things not in terms of a person God, if we insist, but in terms of some kind of a "Gaia theory", or in terms of "chaos theory", and just observe that if we play around with *natural law*, then *the planet* will take *if necessary* forcible measures to protect itself, which may even amount to wiping a lot of us out, if it is *we* who are the problem.

But Gopi Krishna came to warn us that it's not just the natural environment we have to concern ourselves with, it is above all *our own evolutionary path.*

And when we depart from this, it is not so much "God on high" who punishes us, it is rather we make a rod for our own back, we *create* our own wars and terrors and horrors such as the nuclear weapons, and just as in a game of chess, ten moves up ahead there may be some logically unavoidable consequence we don't see coming, and then the King is knocked down, he is forced to resign and from his head unceremoniously slips his fallen crown, which in our case means *the fall of civilisation*, of human order, of harmonious life.

So if this is actually *Natural law*, consequent on *Nature having a purpose*, i.e. as Gopi Krishna alleges, to raise us all mentally to the status of "gods" of "supermen" and "superwomen", which Dawkins and his kind mock and deny, then Dawkins is bringing us all one step closer to our doom by seeking to deny the spiritual, the evolutionary plan of Nature and just imagine it is random and purposeless.

So we might even ask hypothetically, supposing an all seeing God does exist, what is he up to creating the likes of Richard Dawkins?

Our best guess is that evolution is *a challenge.*

We have to remove all superstition from our life and base it on *true science.*

Richard Dawkins is one of the many unwitting instruments in that process.

He is forcing us to look at our many ridiculous ideas about religion, that is – your author does not personally feel he has any *beliefs* as such, because *beliefs* have to be based on an *absolute certainty* that he does not claim, don't they?

But clearly many so called or self-proclaiming "religious people" in the world *do* have such unscientific and irrational *beliefs* as opposed to *views.*

That is, as we have explained elsewhere, it is actually a logical position in the face of undeniable certain death to adopt a religious view, in terms of accepting a certain course of action such as following commandments and so on as a means of getting to "heaven", of an eternal paradise in the after life.

But that doesn't mean we are *certain* of our view, it is either *that* or else *nothing*, eternal *oblivion*, is it not? That's what we mean by *a logical position.*

Because after all, what good is this life if that's all there is? You know – about *nine parts* suffering, boredom and misery, and about *one part* joy.

This is what astounds us the most about the likes of Richard Dawkins and his kind. Why cannot this guy see that horror is just potentially around the corner for all and any of us?

Well, our guess is *he can*, but two things motivate him to carry on what he is doing. Firstly, that he thinks that religion is the problem, when actually – in its *true* rather than *corrupted* form – it is the *only* solution.

i.e. by *religion* we mean the accepting of the *true* evolutionary path of nature, which demands a just society, and that we live harmoniously and moderately, following a few basic rules like Moses Ten Commandments, or Christ's *treat thy neighbour as thyself.*

And as we have said, secondly RD is the subject of a goddess type wife who showers her favours and approval upon him, and just like Ulysses, if we get enticed and enchanted by such a woman we can spend a whole lifetime waking up and maybe even *never* do so, as has been the fate of countless men – likely the vast majority – throughout history.

Because after all, what is it that RD could wake up *to*? Only to his "belief" that there is no God, that he is doomed to die, and he's never coming back or ever going to exist again in any form.

Once again, this is the reason why without any kind of spiritual path there is no hope for us, there is *nothing to wake up to.*

That is, reinterpreted once again, the Adam and Eve story is really telling us that once we are enchanted by woman there is no escape from the bonds of material existence for man except death.

*She* is the beautiful assassin who steals our life force and life away. We will recall also in the Ulysses story – in the *written version* – how Circe the witch took little spoonfuls or whatever of his life force away *at night time.*

Any guesses what that was all about?

Now we understand *kundalini and sex*, i.e. if we have more than *moderate* sex we are robbed of our *evolutionary energy*, the fuel for our *higher understanding*, we see that Circe had Ulysses entrapped by his private parts, his sex desire, by which means she kept him dumbed down and enslaved.

How long is it going to be before the millions of modern men wake up to this *fact*?

Women are *not* necessarily our enemy, in theory they are *our greatest ally*, our *greatest friend*, but we are abusing and failing to understand them, and *that* is the source of our problems also.

For ultimately the whole world depends on this relationship between each man and woman, that is where the whole future of our world is made.

Thus we see when a man deserts his spiritual destiny, and lives under the favours of an enchantress, as Richard Dawkins seems to have done, we see how he moves away from the concept of a God, throws away his *eternal life.*

That is the difference. With women, you get your happiness now, and *pay later* with old age, debilitation and death.

With God on the other hand – so the prophets promise – you learn to be a hero first, you learn to even deny your needs or desires for women *if necessary*, or at least *moderate them* so you can still be in a loving relationship with a woman, but *without being dominated by her or her slave*, and then *when you prove yourself fit* you enter "Valhalla."

Which in *scientific terms* means that you have learned self-discipline, adequate but not necessarily *perfect* control over your desires and actions, and are leading a life in harmony with Nature, exhibiting all the moral qualities such as justice, peacefulness and kindness and respect for your fellow women and men, and this lack of conflict in your psyche *and physiology* enables a breakthrough to occur in your brain.

Suddenly one day we have an experience of "clarity" of "knowingness." We don't just get tearful and excited about a sunset, we get a direct insight into "the mind of God" – he whispers in our ear at least for a while and tells us he is here, *so all the prophets, saints and scriptures tell us*.

But not *verbally*, that is, he lets us hear his "divine music" for a while, and then we know there is beauty, love, order and justice at the basis of the universe, and not some random forces of chance or despotism.

But until we become *our own person*, rise above all or at least most of the petty human qualities of envy and so on, we never get there.

Not necessarily because we are an evil, sinful person, but because the emotional stuff flowing through our nerves and brain tissues *due to this out of control or unnatural behaviour* is a pollutant on our brain, is a deteriorating factor on our whole nervous system, which disbars the kind of "superconductive" (usually temporary) functioning of the brain that occurs in a genuine Samadhi or Nirvana or whatever one likes to call it.

When a man or woman has even a short glimpse of some kind of higher state, if it is genuine, and not just some deluded wishful thinking or meaningless emotional state, it changes their life, as we can see for example with David Icke, formerly a rather dull and dreary sports journalist if our memory serves us right.

We may find even that we develop new talents, or enhancement of ones we had before, because we are not talking wishful thinking, we are talking *brain modification*, we are talking of the same biological processes that were active in raising the mind of a baby to that of a child, and the mind of a child to an adolescent, and then a young adult, at which time as we see with so many artists, musicians, poets, and even scientists, the brain has a power of intelligence to achieve wonders it never could before, such as the sudden flowering of *the Beatles* in their early twenties.

Because what modern science has failed to explain is the so called "missing link", the transition from Neanderthal man or whatever, to *what we are now.*

And the answer appears to be mainly *continued evolution of the brain*, and quite likely far too quickly to have occurred by "random chance."

For after all, let us just consider *the nature* of random chance itself.

Let us compare the man who carefully plans his career, saves money, wisely invests it and continues reinvesting his time and money in his future. He maybe ends up as Bill Gates. He certainly ends up as what we would call "a worldly success." He has *intelligence, planning* working for him.

So let us compare him to a labourer who at weekend spends all his money on gambling with the hope of winning a fortune.

Who do we think will prosper in this game of *intelligent design versus random chance*?

Our guess is that random chance as the prime mover of reality would lead only to endless deterioration, to disorder, as happens with the gambling addict.

What we see in Nature is on the contrary, the continual establishment of complex structure, of pattern.

Dawkins and his kind tell us genetic mutation to superior states happens in "a black box" in which some kind of roulette wheel spins or some dice are shaken.

They can't however tell us *what is going on* in that black box, their assertion is simply the indeterminate theory that *if we keep rattling those dice long enough* something *good* will happen in that black box.

Well, if they can create some *life* – even the simplest bacteria – with such a *random* box of tricks we will believe them. But sadly, we don't have the likely *several billion years* that they might guess such an experiment might need to run.

Dawkins then goes on to quote once again from his alleged friend Douglas Adams, who made a speech mentioning how it appeared that people should not be so upset about Richard Dawkins' activities, and that what we needed was a "free debate."

Well, that is just marvellous. That really *is* what we need – a *free debate.*

But that "debate" which has started with *the conclusion* that *there is no God*, and denies the validity of all the experience and words of the prophets and mystics and saints throughout history, and thus refuses to admit this information as *evidence*, can hardly be called *free* can it?

And here is yet another very worrying symptom of RD's belief system.

He is apparently outraged that one can on religious grounds be excused from *war*, when any other kind of draft dodger gets put in prison or whatever.

Well, thank the Lord, that *the law* has at least left us this *one sole avenue of escape* from the tyranny that surrounds us, which we have advised our readers to use in any situation whatsoever for such a cause to refuse to take part in the evil, injustice or immorality that surrounds us all.

But Mr Dawkins, *currently* smug and secure with his fame, money and his goddess wife wants to take away from us our last vestige of hope, our last line of defence, just as we explained in our recent work, *The Truth About Obsessive Compulsive Disorders*, the lady therapist forced the teenage boy to give up his last island of security, his in our view *legitimate* feeling of desire for privacy and control over his computer and the personal space of his bedroom.

RD wants to say "Hey, you can't go copping out of war service, just because Allah, or Buddha or whoever doesn't agree with it. It's *not fair on the poor atheist.* It's *discrimination* against atheists."

Our best guess is that *a lot more people* will be "finding religion" just as soon as they figure this out.

For instance, let us suppose that any particular *religion* – as indeed many *have done*, hence another understandable reason why so many modern women are against them – says that men should have *rights* to sex with their wife, instead of being at her

whim and mercy in this regard and in fear of rape accusations, as is now the average Western man (incidentally we discovered lately that the crime of rape of husband on wife had only been *created* in British law in 1991, but naturally all these feminist lawyers we have warned you about were soon on to that one, just as soon as they got their feet under the table of the legal world).

Men might actually have *rights* on such a basis. *Imagine* that.

But of course, when you are the slave of a goddess, who needs *rights*?

Apparently it's *not OK* to be the subject of and at the mercy of a just, caring, impartial God, whom you are too ignorant and selfish or lazy to take the time to understand the motives of, but it *is* very much OK for a man to be the powerless slave of a female goddess, of a woman.

Well, if it's not, somehow we haven't heard Mr Dawkins complaining much about *that*.

We are quite confident that we can take to pieces similarly every single sentence of Mr Dawkins' latest effort to deny the undeniable – i.e. not that there *is definitely* a God, but that there is enough *eye-witness* evidence out there from the prophets and saints, and *no scientific proof to the contrary* to suggest to us that by far the most sensible option is not to surrender to *dogma* from either side, but to assess whatever is before us in a completely impartial and rational way.

But we are going to stop now, so as not to bore our readers and because quite frankly Christmas is coming, and we have got better things to do as we are sure have our readers.

This brief review of just the opening first few chapters of his book has led us to the considered opinion that there is no *half-truth* that Mr Dawkins won't tell in seeking to justify his unjustifiable position, like a lawyerly mother who seeks to defend the wrongs of her own child at all costs, twisting and reformulating every one under the sun's word who might have possibly led us to the clearly (so he tells us) wrong conclusion that they gave any credence to any view other than unashamed and confirmed atheism, and that we have seen the clear and convincing evidence of his enslavement to not only his wife, but his pandering to the usual causes of womens' issues, gay rights and so on.

He actually seeks to compare the position of gays, subject possibly to actual physical persecution, to atheists, who really despite perhaps some childhood injustice against them are now only subject to the irritation of the fact that *somebody else actually believes in something*, whereas they don't.

We will finish our brief review with the observation that in our local bookshop, we found a number of copies of Richard Dawkins' latest book we have been here commenting upon, *The God Delusion*, lying in a heap, and laid on top of them all was a single copy of the autobiography of Victoria Beckham, formerly of the pop band *The Spice Girls*, then known as "Posh Spice."

This is *all* that is on offer in our modern world, and do we really think the two works are unrelated?

Doesn't that "coincidence" just say it all?

i.e. the former book is telling us *there is no god*, and the latter is telling us, *worship woman, woman is all the god you'll ever need.*

Richard Dawkins is apparently aghast that while the American public have little or no objection to women in power as to electability, at least 50% are opposed to putting *atheists* into high public office.

Why should this man not understand that for those who don't believe in a fundamentally caring God and moreover the morality as espoused by Christ, the

worry and in our view near certainty is that they therefore believe in *nothing*, and surely is it simply logical to suppose that those who believe in nothing will have great difficulty should they gain power in believing in the value and significance of *you* and *me*?

To them, we may simply be aberrant carriers of *the virus of faith*, and therefore sworn enemies of "liberalist" freedom, and thus ultimately like any disease should sooner or later be totally disempowered and exterminated.

Surely, *that* is the only logical position that can ultimately arise out of the atheistic view – i.e. we are all animals, and those who threaten our territory, it is legitimate to exterminate.

For indeed, is this not the actuality of our modern world, trying to exterminate or repress those with faith or moral convictions, who might oppose the oppressors, manipulators and selfish libertines, that we see more and more before us every day?

This is the world over which fashion icons like Victoria Beckham and quasi-scientists such as Richard Dawkins preside.

Everything in this world is currently on sale at a price – even babies so it appears (not mentioning any names), and of course *women* have been on sale for a long time now.

The only good news is that although it is not currently very popular, as in the case of this non-profit seeking work before you, the truth is mostly *free.*

Merry Christ-mas everybody, wherever you are, and whoever you may be.

***Also by the same author***

*A Mens Liberation Guide to Women 4th edition*

*An Innocent Woman's Guide to Men*

*How to Meditate*

*Kundalini - Preventing the Apocalypse*

*A Mens and Womens Liberation Update*

*The Myth of the Teenage Rebellion*

*What Is Intelligence?*

*Kundalini - A Personal Experience*

*Feminal Farm - a short satirical novel*

*The Innocent Persons Guide to Law*

*Understanding Female Sexuality and Porn*

*Freedom of Speech & Maitreya*

*An Innocent Persons Guide to the Da Vinci Code*

*How the Feminists Stole Psychology*

*Hearing Voices and Psychic Phenomena*

*The Psychology of Soaps*

*Is Competition Necessary?*

*On Drugs and Alcohol*

*The Importance of Thinkers*

*The Demonisation of the Innocents*

*The Psychology of Prejudice*

*Science and Fear*

*The Scientist and the Guru*

*Respect for Age*

*A Waste of Paper*

*Saying No to Peer Pressure*

*Smashing the Da Vinci Code*

*If Men Went on Strike*

*A Message to Readers*

*Why Size Doesn't Matter*

*Afraid of Women*

*The Feminist Offenders Register*

*The Truth about Obsessive Compulsive Disorders*

*Why Capitalism Doesn't Work*

*All Sam Fryman's works are currently available free of charge via the link*

*http://www.geocities.com/thmlplx/*

*as .lit files which can be read with the free Microsoft Reader*

*http://www.microsoft.com/reader/downloads/pc.asp*